UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Menace of Orthodoxies - *Leo Hirsch*

A Letter to Paul Robeson - *Peter H. Samsom*

How a Day Nursery Can Spread Health - - - - - - - *Ethel S. Beer*

The Method of Liberalism - *J. Ray Shute*

The Power of Planning - *Herbert Sturges*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXVI NUMBER 4

Chicago, September-October, 1950

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Ethel S. Beer: Author of *Day Nursery.*

Thaddeus B. Clark: Minister of the First Unitarian Church of St. Louis, Missouri.

Leo Hirsch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

Joseph Remenyi: Professor of Comparative Literature, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Peter H. Samsom: Minister of the First Unitarian Church of San Diego, California.

J. Ray Shute: Mayor of Monroe, North Carolina.

Herbert Sturges: Formerly, professor in Lombard College, Galesburg, Illinois.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 63

ARTICLES—

The Menace of Orthodoxies—LEO HIRSCH 64

A Letter to Paul Robeson—PETER H. SAMSOM 68

How a Day Nursery Can Spread Health—ETHEL S. BEER 71

The Method of Liberalism—J. RAY SHUTE 74

The Power of Planning—HERBERT STURGES 76

THE STUDY TABLE—

Doubting Is Not Denial—JOSEPH REMENYI 77

Epitaph for Orthodoxy—THADDEUS B. CLARK 78

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 79

THE FIELD—

Understanding Nehru—*Worldover Press* 62

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Understanding Nehru

Despite the collapse of his efforts at mediation, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India has supported the United Nations policy in Korea. Recently Nehru went so far as to say: "Those young men of the United States who are fighting and dying in Korea certainly do not represent dollar imperialism."

To countless observers throughout the world, Nehru's "contradictions" have been perplexing. Is he trying to appease Moscow in order to promote India's safety if a world war should come? Or is he so peace-minded as to be completely unrealistic?

Nehru's correspondence with Stalin and Acheson brought almost as much confusion to the Indian press as it did to the outside world. A survey of some leading newspapers reveals startling differences. The *Hindustan Times* pointed out that Nehru's interest in China was not new, but conceded "the danger that both Communist China and the U.S.S.R., after they have secured entry into the Council, would use their powers to frustrate U.N. action . . . is indeed a real one." The *Times of India* declared, "The Soviet reply to the Indian plea for substitution of the olive branch in Korea amounts to an encouraging 'Yes' and the American reply to a discouraging 'No'." On the other hand, *The Statesman* said that while the American answer was disappointing, "it could hardly have been otherwise."

The *National Herald* commented on the many-nation support for the U.S. in the U.N., but inferred that "the U.S. aim seems to be to use this situation to score a decisive advantage against Communism." And failing to foresee that the United States would insist on treating the Korean question and the admission of Red China apart, and on their merits, the *Madras Mail* asserted: "The fact is that neither the U.S.A. nor Russia regards the Korean conflict as being unrelated to the admission of Communist China to the Security Council or vice versa."

It is no wonder that a governmental policy so confusing at home should be widely misconstrued abroad. The real key to Nehru's

(*Continued on page* 78)

UNITY

Volume CXXXVI SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1950 No. 4

EDITORIAL

Events in Korea give good hope that the democratic forces of the world will really learn how to act together on a world scale for the defense and the advance of democracy. Although depending largely on the United States, the United Nations action in Korea is a landmark in human history. This action has saved the United Nations from the fate of the old League of Nations. A world organization without the will and the power to halt aggression cannot win the confidence of the peoples of the earth. Many good things are being done and more can be done by the United Nations, but the one thing that is basic to all others, and without which world organization fails, is the maintenance of international peace. Big nations must not be allowed to gobble up small nations. Orderly change and development must be possible without the threat of violence. Invading hordes cannot be allowed to ravage neighboring countries. A permanent international police force, capable of quick and effective action, is an absolute necessity if world peace is to be maintained. All of this now seems obvious. But to implement these ideals and purposes is not easy and an international police force alone is not sufficient so long as even one big power is not world minded. An international police force must be backed up by the overwhelming power of big nations that are world minded. Without the quick action of the United States Government in the Korean situation, the United Nations could have become a mere paper organization overnight. The United States possesses power, leadership, and prestige that make its responsibility great in connection with maintaining the peace of the world. Whenever possible this responsibility should be exercised through the channels of the United Nations. Such channelling will enhance our moral position and spread the weight of the burden. But most important of all it will help the United Nations to grow into a world power. So long as veto rights exist in the Security Council it will be necessary in some instances for the United States to function under the United Nations provision for regional agreements, as for example the North Atlantic arrangement. It should be our policy to amend the United Nations charter to eliminate the veto power where aggression is involved, but meanwhile we must use such devices as are available. A long and hard road stretches ahead, but we have made a good beginning in Korea.

Curtis W. Reese.

The Menace of Orthodoxies

LEO HIRSCH

Religious, political, and economic orthodoxies are the greatest impediments to man's further growth and progress. This seems a hard, bold, and sweeping statement, but let us examine the world situation through which we are passing and agonizing, and try to ascertain with some accuracy the facts that actually confront us. In the present world situation, the first thing that strikes us is the existence of an outstanding phenomenon that thrusts the force of its impact into our consciousness, namely, that orthodoxies and particularly orthodox religions are having a perfect field day and largely at the expense of all those liberal and humanistic religious movements that have succeeded in breaking the chains of theological doctrines, ceremonialisms, dogmatisms.

We know that it is only five years ago that the greatest of all wars of all times was ended. Indescribable cruelties were practised during that war, hitherto unknown to man. The most fiendish weapons of destruction were applied that leveled not only a town or village here and there, but leveled entire cities and even larger areas and at one fell attack destroyed the major portion of their population. Due to these catastrophes, we find in nearly every nation on this earth, with the exception of the United States, the Dominion of Canada, Switzerland, and Sweden, millions of men, women, and children who are a short step away from actually starving to death or freezing to death.

The second fact confronting us is that everywhere, including our own country, we find hysteria, ceaseless unrest whether above or below the surface, revolt, rebellions, general strikes that paralyze an entire nation, rumors of wars and preparations for the third World War, and general mental and moral confusion. These are the facts that are putting fear and terror into the minds of millions of human beings.

What are the causes that have brought these tragedies into the human scene on a world-wide scale? We shall present two major causes but no doubt there are plenty of others. The first cause is that orthodox religions during the past decade undertook intensive propaganda campaigns which unquestionably added to their already large membership. Let me illustrate. We know definitely that the Catholic Church during the past five years, during the war years, and quite a few years before the war—particularly when Pope Pius Pacelli headed the Vatican's State Department—undertook this major propaganda campaign and carried it through even into the post-war period. We also know that during the last Italian elections the Catholic Church was no longer content to function through its church instrumentality but directly entered the political field and with the aid of the United States Government won an outstanding victory, not for political democracy and democratic institutions but for clericalism and orthodox religion. Other orthodox religious organizations followed the leadership of the Catholic Church and spent, and are still spending, millions of dollars for these propaganda campaigns. We also know that Soviet Russia spent huge sums of money and exerted tremendous effort to spread its secular religion of materialism and economic determinism.

The second cause of these tragedies is that most of our media of communications are owned and controlled by a small group of men whose deliberate purpose it is to feed the public mind with the type of information they desire to dispense. Thus the public mind is in a constant state of ignorance and confusion, and therefore incapable of analyzing the root causes of its distress.

It is important to know that the major idea behind the propaganda of orthodox religions is that man possesses an evil nature and that he lacks both the ability and power to transcend that limitation without the direct intervention of a supernatural being.

This constant stream of propaganda has had two serious results: (1) it has undermined and nearly destroyed man's faith in his own powers to solve the problems of his present crisis; and (2) it has had the effect to free men of their moral responsibility to accept the challenge that is upon them to develop our moral characters, so that we may ultimately build a nobler civilization.

In the religious area you will recognize this as the position of orthodox Christianity with its overemphasis on man's sinful nature and its sole reliance on the interjection of a supreme being to bring him salvation. With very little variation, this is the position of most orthodox religion, whether it be Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, Mohammedanism, Hinduism, or any other.

In the field of politics and economics, too, there is evidence of a return to orthodoxy. Everywhere men are seeking in these various fields the same sort of thing that they seem to find in orthodox religions, namely, a dependence and reliance on some power outside themselves, and are looking upon that power to achieve those things that men have come to feel lie beyond their capacity.

We are, therefore, witnessing today a world-wide struggle between two economic orthodoxies—Capitalism and Communism. The Capitalists claim that only through their system can mankind be saved. They overlook the fact that freedom and democracy are not the inventions of the capitalist system.

The Communists, on the other hand, tell us that we must choose between their dictatorship and Fascism; that Capitalism inevitably leads to wars; that Capitalism contains the seeds of its own destruction with its imperialisms, its extreme inequalities, its cruel exploitations, its secret diplomacy, its armed interventions, and its greed for profits and power.

It would be moral suicide to accept either of these extreme claims as exhausting the field of human possibility. Both of these extremes in economic thought are irrational and intolerant, and tend to destroy both freedom and democracy.

Fortunately, these orthodoxies are not the only possible points of view. There is another point of view that seems to me to be valid and more nearly the truth. Let us call this the heterodox point of view because it is chiefly held by non-conformists in religion, politics, and economics. They maintain that the great lesson of the last war is the responsibility of man for his world of human affairs.

This brings us face to face with the realization that, if there are to be no more wars, it is up to man—and not God—to prevent their occurrence. If we want all men on this earth to enjoy more justice, love, brotherhood, peace, and unity than what they have enjoyed, it is up to man to build the better world that will satisfy these human needs. This is a hard and difficult lesson to learn and to apply because it is contrary to the whole stream of thinking of all the past centuries.

Let us first examine some of the doctrines of orthodox religions and see to what extent they impede man's further social progress. The first fact we must recognize is that all orthodox religions are fundamentalist in their viewpoint. Christianity, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, rests the basis of its belief on authority. This authority rests neither on historical knowledge nor scientific research. The source of authority is the infallible wisdom of the Pope, the infallibility of the Bible, the Virgin Birth, the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Atonement, the omnipotence of the Holy Spirit. For orthodox Judaism, the source of authority is the one God, the one Bible, the one Law, the Promised Land, the Chosen People.

Hinduism and Mohammedanism are also orthodox in their viewpoints, that is to say they are fundamentalist. They have little relationship to modern life. Hinduism and Mohammedanism as practised by the multitudes are quite apart from life. This, of course, does not imply that a few of their leaders have not worked out for themselves the philosophical foundations to their belief. That philosophy, however, is in the minds of only the few elite. These are religions with innumerable rites and ceremonies, holy days and festivals, pilgrimages and superstitions that turn men away from life. They are largely the preparation for another life and remind one of medieval Christianity. They have immersed their followers in superstitions that have almost blotted out the spark of light in the human soul.

It is significant to know that the United States has been the birthplace of new types of fundamentalist religions. Whether this is due to our religious freedom or to our leanings toward the supernatural, it is difficult to say. I refer, of course, to Mormonism and Christian Science. In the case of Mormonism, its followers believe in the fiction that Joseph Smith, by divine authority, reclaimed from the earth certain golden plates on which were inscribed certain commandments, like the two stone tablets of Moses, and that these were incorporated in the Book of Mormon as a direct revelation from God.

In the case of Christian Science, its followers believe that Mary Baker Eddy was ordered by God to write a new Bible, and every word in it is a direct message from God. Here was a woman of little intellectual development and no scientific training, and yet her Bible is accepted as inspired by millions of her devout followers. Without any effort to appraise this religious movement, it is important to note that what it contains of truth has been long known as a central part of medical science from Hippocrates on and what original contributions it does contain are nothing more than imagination plus rhetoric. The fantastic claims of miraculous cures made by Christian Science have caused many tragedies in homes where Christian Science has a firm hold.

To all these orthodox religions truth is known by revelation as given to man direct by God and does not need verification of experience. The critical spirit and scientific examination in regard to all these beliefs are denied and resented. The modernists and reformists are in conflict with the fundamentalists. They neither hold the same premises, nor do they talk the same language. It might be said that such reform movements in the Christian Church as the Unitarians are no longer Christian as viewed by the fundamentalists, and apparently the fundamentalists are right. For the Unitarians no longer accept the infallible beliefs of orthodox Christianity. This also applies to Reformed Judaism that tries to modify the old beliefs to meet the modern conditions of science and technology.

All these religious orthodoxies tend to place less emphasis on fundamental religion as a guide to conduct and more on dogma and theological doctrines. It limits the rule of reason and nullifies man's intellectual faculty. It emphasizes pride of opinion and stresses intolerance of differing ideas. It destroys the process of free thought and free inquiry and creates stagnation and deterioration. It minimizes and discourages the search for truth as the great goal of man. It destroys good will because each religious group deifies its own impersonal theological ideas to the debasement of all other religious ideas.

What these orthodox religions refuse to admit is that all these various forms of religions came out of the creative imagination, the ethical aspirations, the fears and superstitions in men's minds. And as long as man possesses neither omniscience nor omnipotence, simple honesty requires us to admit that none of our creeds and dogmas is entirely free of guesswork. This lack of omniscience is not met by reliance on faith, intuition, or authority. For however certain we *feel,* we *never know* that such faith, intuition, or authority will not prove itself mistaken.

The great religious teachers, Socrates, Jesus, Gandhi, Theodore Parker, Emerson, Adler, and others—like the morally wise men of science—have taught the great lesson of humility, namely, that there exist always vast realms beyond our range or control and that we ought to cultivate a wise resignation to our limitations. True religion must liberate the mind from the restraints of authoritarianism and fanaticism. Prophets, priestly hierarchies, sacred books, and sanctified traditions must submit their claims to the court of human reason and experience. Unless men reason, they will remain the victims of blind dogmatism, clinging obstinately to questionable beliefs without the awareness that these may be mere prejudices.

Orthodoxies have nearly destroyed our belief in progress and the need for social change. They have created the vast gulf between our technological advance and our social institutions, and have thus brought about an alarming growth of cultural lag, until it threatens racial extinction. They have prevented the modernization of our social institutions, and therefore are responsible for most of the public problems and social evils of our age. Their complete faith in the power of the supernatural over human thinking has been little affected by scientific progress. Tradition and emotion, rather than fact and logic, prevail among their followers. Belief and conviction remain supreme. All these beliefs and convictions, and the various institutions resting on them, are overwhelmingly the product of contributions from the pre-scientific era. So that orthodox religions and their conventional moral attitudes are little different in fundamentals from what they were

in the Middle Ages. Therefore, our institutions and social thinking are antiquated and mosaic, and are accretions from the Stone Age.

These powerful orthodox religious organizations, in cöoperation with powerful economic groups who are their financial mainstays, are playing the role of mediator in the conflicts within the state and the role of umpire of the social process.

Orthodox religions have all but destroyed man's faith in self-reliance. If man has that faith, then he is willing to undertake seemingly impossible tasks. But this faith is not supported by orthodox religions that conceived man as a puppet of God, exposed to constant interference and frustration by his creator.

In contrast to the orthodoxies, Ethical Religion looks upon man as possessing the power of creativeness, having the same eternal power as the source from which it stems, having a nature of illimitable dimensions—a being with a will of his own giving him the right and the duty to exercise it; a being having all the qualities which are needed for the realization of his spiritual ideals.

In the religious sphere, therefore, it is imperative that we abandon all these infallibilities and fixities of the orthodoxies and apply to some extent the technique of the scientific method of observation, critical examination, experimentation in human conduct, and generalization.

Let us now examine the two orthodox economic systems that are in the grip of a life and death struggle. On the one hand we have the outworn capitalist system. It is a system of waste, without security for the individual, under-consumption, low standard of living, poverty, unemployment, and the like. It accounts for inadequate housing, much needless disease, sickness, and death. It is what has produced most of the wars and prevents constructive plans for peace. Capitalism's core is its excessive devotion to the profit motive; hence the individual and human labor are secondary and therefore it is not concerned with adequate mass purchasing power. It concentrates its main effort to develop a market of restricted volume for merchandise and services of the poorest quality to be sold at the highest obtainable returns.

Most labor unions have imitated this pattern of behavior from the Capitalists and have demanded the highest wage for the least amount of work. The public is caught and ground between these two millstones of greed, and this prevents the emergence of an economy of abundance.

The other orthodox economic system that is brought to world attention is Communism. Communism is a deeply rooted philosophy of life and politics and economics constituting the political and economic religion of Russia, formulated by Marx and Engels, developed, expanded, and applied by Lenin and Stalin, and instilled during the past three decades by every device known to modern propaganda technique into the whole of the Russian people. The Communism of our time is a stern return to Karl Marx and the old socialist orthodoxy. Marx is its chief prophet who rolled together into a composite the dialectic of Hegel, the materialism of Feuerbach, the economics of Proudhon. It means the complete socialization of the means of production and distribution and exchange. It means the dictatorship of the proletariat and eventually a classless society. All this to be achieved by revolution and force and violence.

In contradistinction to this, democracy will never permit any one group to acquire permanent control of all the powers of government. Democracy stands foursquare on its belief that society should be free of the domination of any one class and that it should provide the greatest opportunity for each individual to work out his own salvation and destiny. Democracy rejects absolutes and insists on freedom of experimentation: trial and error. Democracy is uncompromisingly opposed to the infallibility of any one economic theory which is held fixed and unchangeable and adequate to satisfy all the requirements of man. The curse of all orthodoxies—religious, political, and economic—is that their followers believe that their ideologies contain the whole and final truth for all time. Democracy, on the other hand, believes in the validity of many different faiths, a wide diversity of beliefs; and the tolerance of this diversity is the bedrock to which our national unity is anchored. The sanctity and inviolability of each human soul was one of the main springs of the development of our democracy. We must never lose sight of those goals toward which we strive by collective action; we must continue to think in terms of the welfare of the community as well as of the individual.

We must firmly reject Russia's totalitarian viewpoint that the collective end justifies the means, that the individual should be sacrificed to the state. We maintain the opposite viewpoint: that each individual is an important part of the whole and therefore related to the structure of the universe.

It is apparent from the foregoing that orthodox religions and orthodox economics have worked along parallel lines. They have both worked out theological doctrines and economic theories and have endowed them with infallibility and supreme authority to be accepted for all time without changes or correction. These indoctrinated ideologies in turn create closed minds and an intolerance that leads to hate, inquisitions, and liquidations in the name of absolute universal truth. So that whether it be religious, political, or economic orthodoxy, the end result is the same.

Just as the Christians deified Jesus and sainted St. Paul and others, so the Communists sainted Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, and the Capitalists sainted the Vanderbilts, the Rockefellers, the Morgans, and the Fords. Just as the Christians believe that faith in Jesus will save them and the world, so the Communists believe that the Marxian Gospel is the one and only way to salvation, the only cure of poverty and exploitation. And the Capitalists believe that Capitalism is the only road to freedom, democracy, and salvation.

These gospels of finality and salvation therefore are the great menace of our times, for men will die willingly in these causes and be happy to wage war and destroy the heretics, the non-believers. This convinces the writer that we are morally and spiritually not only in pre-scientific times but we have not passed the thinking of primitive society. During primitive times, too, men feared to change the social pattern for fear of some great disaster and severe punishment from the offended gods.

What we need desperately today to save us from

these orthodoxies and their infallibilities, fixities, panaceas, and salvations are the contributions of social scientists and social inventors, who—by devising new and better forms of government, economic institutions, ethical practices, and appropriate educational systems —will thus bring our lagging institutions and lagging social thinking up to date and more in harmony with our technological advance and the present demands of our democratic way of life.

How can we remedy the present situation? What can we do? Are we to submit to despair and say we are helpless?

First, we must cease our orthodox viewpoint toward our own government and its constitution. It is important to understand that our government and the constitution were planned and established with the deliberate purpose of renouncing political orthodoxies with belief in the "divine right" of kings and its corollary that kings are infallible. Democracy, as Lincoln defined it, basically means a "government of the people, by the people and for the people" with the people assuming full *responsibility* and *authority* for its welfare and management. Therefore, if we find that fundamental changes are needed, let us add as many amendments to our constitution as conditions demand, adequate to the responsibilities of the machine age. Our democratic government is placed in serious danger because the difficulty of the many problems to be handled has not been paralleled by a comparable effort to train and secure greater expertness and honesty in public office. We must also remedy the indifference and apathy that are shown by the masses of our citizens in any active interest in government. We ought to have a law compelling every citizen to vote. We must prevent our government from drifting in the present national and international crisis. Government today must have a plan—a well-thought-out plan.

Second, our educational system, too, must be drastically revised so as to meet the technological advance, the demand for spiritual leadership and a new type of cooperation. Our present system is little more than an inheritance from feudal times, as there are no evident signs of any effort to criticize the social order and to suggest its improvement. At best, like orthodox religions, it tends to sanctify things as they are and thus constitute a powerful obstacle to planned changes within the democratic structure of society. Hence, we must train our boys and girls not in the nationalistic spirit but in world citizenship. We must find a method to achieve social change without the dilemma of using either the totalitarian weapon of force or the ineffectual weapon of indifference and drift. Education, therefore, must develop men who will be willing to live and die responsibly for an idea—the democratic idea. Not unless man himself can be improved can any social order now survive. Whether we like it or not, we must deal with spirit as well as mind. Let us face the fact that what the world must have is a fuller cultivation of those qualities which are best termed spiritual. Whatever we may think as to their origin, we should no longer scoff at them, for on their strength depends our survival. To bring together the two great disciplines of mind and spirit, the sciences and the humanities, is the compelling task for education. The greatest peril is not from lack of education but from one-sided, partly educated, indoctrinated men. Only well-rounded, free, whole men can save the world today. And to train them well is the test and task of education. Education as constituted today retards social planning for further social advances and, by thus obstructing orderly and long overdue social changes, actually encourages and precipitates revolution and the violence that goes with it.

Third, through religious and ethical education we ought to discipline ourselves to an attitude of humility. We ought to understand that we are not omniscient and omnipotent and therefore our reasoning faculty has its limitations and that we are fallible; that the few facts we have grasped are insignificant compared with the vast sea of the unknown; and that we cannot grasp the full picture of the universal whole, so that at best our knowledge is fragmentary. We are accustomed to a habit of thinking which proclaims as *the whole truth* principles which are only a *part* of it, and then we endow this small segment of truth with the attributes of religion. With passionate zeal we declare it as the lone, guiding star of our lives. We ought to understand that religion is not theology or dogma or superstition, but that it is life heroic, noble, triumphant—lived on the spiritual plane of enduring values. Its aim is brotherhood, peace, and unity. Thus we must have the courage to abandon orthodoxy, which is the humiliating surrender of man's spiritual nature to some inflexible theological doctrine. Let us retain any kernel of truth that the dogma may contain and let us discard the covering dross.

Fourth, we must never relinquish our quest for truth. Despite the present limitations of our intellect, we must never lose our faith in its potential power to further growth. We must fearlessly examine the validity of all opinion and ideas projected by the mind and expose them to examination and discussion and inquiry. This of course is in direct opposition to the concept of revelation.

Fifth, we must no longer delay to change our present economic system. It must be a system free of any orthodox label and absolutely free of any fixed ideology. It must be a flexible economy, perhaps a composite of free enterprise (let us not confuse private enterprise with free enterprise, for no area of private enterprise is really free), Parliamentary Democratic Socialism and Cooperation. In planning this new economic system, we ought to clearly understand that democracy is not Capitalism. Democracy emphasizes above all else human values that demand responsibility for every right and the performance of duty above any ideology. This simply means that an economic system's function is to administer the country for the welfare of all its citizens.

Sixth, finally, we must fully assume our individual and collective responsibility for the development of sound public opinion and judgment. We must once and for all abandon the orthodox religious viewpoint that we are the puppets of circumstance or of a wilfull, frustrating, supernatural power; or that we are headed, as Spengler claimed, for extinction and that we can do nothing about it. The very belief that we are mere puppets deprives us of the sense of responsibility that might save us. This sense of futility, fatalism, and helplessness destroys our will to proceed to further truth and better things, and to determine that truth alone shall guide us and save us. This attitude undermines and destroys the very foundations of democracy, which maintains that the individual is primary, not secondary; creative, not derivative; and that the individual is supremely important and is the foundation of free government.

A Letter To Paul Robeson

PETER H. SAMSOM

Dear Mr. Robeson:

You don't know me, but a man as prominent in public life as you are must be accustomed to receiving letters from people of whom you have never heard. I would like to write you in the spirit of letter-writing as it used to be, when men wrote each other to share their best thinking about life's problems. I want to set down some of the thoughts which have been troubling me about you and your role in American life today.

Along with millions of others, I know you, at least on the surface, for by your very position in the political, and at one time in the cultural, life of America, your personality, your views, and your talents are known to many who will never know you personally. For years I have watched you, and, at least when you were a noted singer, admired you from afar. I have heard you on the concert stage and on the air, and time without number have enjoyed your recordings such as the magnificent "Ballad for Americans," and your stirring presentation of the work songs and battle songs of different nations. Through all these media, your powerful personality has been conveyed to those who heard you, and obviously no one can fail to feel that your art is deeply a part of your personality. The music you love is not separated from the daily concerns of your life in any "art for art's sake" ivory tower. None can ever think of you as an effete artist who closes his art off from the world around him. But I wonder if you fully realize the danger of this mingling of art with politics. Many have pointed out recently, and they are not by any means all unfriendly to you, that you are a man of talent who has been carried away by an enthusiasm for left-wing politics, that you have subordinated your artistic ability to your political convictions. As the *New Yorker* put it editorially, ". . . when he mixes Ol' Man River with Ol' Man Marx, he is being unfair to the Mississippi and is playing fast and loose with the Negro race, for whom he purports to speak."

Now a good many singers and painters, even great ones, manage to work through their whole lives without giving their publics any inkling of what they think about the world and its affairs; and if that is how they do their best work, more power to them. Obviously you do not work at your best in this manner. You have to sing other songs than "Trees" and "On The Road to Mandalay" to get your soul into your work. But, Mr. Robeson, you must not be surprised or shocked when men comment that you have departed from one field, music, where you have training and eminence, and entered another, politics, where you have no particular authority, experience, or talent—where you are just another amateur. Nor must you sound so shocked when you hear men say that you have become merely a cultural front-man for American Communists and their friends. When you make art the servant of your political views, you are no longer singing as a singer but as a political ideologist, and you lay yourself open for such interpretations, as does any man who enters the field of left-wing politics. In politics, the gloves are off, my friend.

But regardless of what we may think of your integrity, anyone who has followed your career realizes what has happened to you. You used to be known primarily as one of America's great bass voices, but today you are known as one of America's leading Soviet sympathizers. This is, of course, primarily your own business; a man still has the legal right to any political position he wants to take, though it seems that if one rises high enough in one particular party he is liable to go to jail; the Supreme Court will have some interesting things to say about that decision some day. I don't know if it's true that you really are out to overthrow the government—whether you want to do it, as Hitler tried to, by violence, or simply as the Republicans keep trying to every few years. I'm not even sure how much of a Communist Joseph Stalin is, for it seems to me that Russian-style Communism has come a long, long way from what Karl Marx once wrote about. But it is surely more important to be concerned about what a man says and does than about what label we are to paste on him. That is why I am concerned about you, Mr. Robeson. You are a prominent American still loved by many for your great talent and your courageous convictions. You sent your son to school in Russia rather than here because you believed he would get a better education as a citizen of the world there. In recent years you have become openly and frankly connected with a number of groups in America whose basic affiliations are not nearly as open and frank as your devotion to them. The net result of all this is that your own personal position and the exact nature of your real political loyalties have been seriously questioned, and many rightly or wrongly have repudiated you as an artist and as an American because of your peculiar political propensities. This is your own business, but because of your influential position it is not *only your* business. It becomes a force of some weight in the lives of many others too.

I need only mention the obvious fact that, to the people of your own race, you have long been a powerful symbol. You have fought for civil and human rights for Negroes and all racial minorities; you have magnificently identified yourself with their struggle for decent, fair, American treatment. Now, if your actions, utterances, and affiliations are leading observant people to believe that you have fallen for the Communist party line, what happens to the cause you have stood for, racial justice—a cause far bigger than you, but inevitably identified with you because of your symbolic position? What happens to any cause when its symbolic leaders lose the respect and trust of thoughtful people?

This matter of your place as a racial symbol in American life is an important one. Let us grant that there will always be some in public life—men who hate progress and fear democracy for anyone but themselves—who will not hesitate cynically to paint you with a dirty brush in order to discredit not only you, but the cause of racial justice for which you are known, because racial justice is what they really fear. This is one of the elementary facts of political life. But do you really believe that this is all that has happened to you, that you are simply an abused victim of unscrupulous reactionaries and red-baiters who

label you a Communist to keep the Negro down? Come, come, Mr. Robeson, you are not as naive as that, nor as neurotic, I hope, for no mature man will react in such a neurotic way to the realities of political life, such as criticism and attack. No, let us admit that you yourself have given people quite some reason to question your real political faith and your own basic loyalty to the peculiarly American concept of democratic freedom for all points of view, partly because of your obvious connection with groups in America which have just as little regard for genuine democratic liberty of thought and expression as have the reactionaries you so resoundingly lambaste in your songs and speeches.

This is what worries people who know your ability and still want to respect you. Even more important, this is what worries people who believe in the possibilities of American-style democracy for achieving freedom and justice for all in our nation. When a man who has been respected as a fighting liberal gets himself all tangled up with questionable political outfits, and comes out in public saying perfectly fantastic things which deeply embarrass the cause he has symbolized, it is a matter of concern for all liberal Americans, and should be for him too.

An example of such indiscreet public utterance is your statement that American Negroes would never take up arms against Russia. What on earth did you mean by such a preposterous remark? I share with you most fervently the hope that nobody will ever have to take up arms in a war between Russia and the United States. But why single out the Negroes? You may not have meant to cast a slur on the Americanism of the Negro people but you certainly did their cause no good by such a statement. I should think that you, of all people, as a symbol of the Negro's struggle for complete freedom of opportunity, would have stopped to think of the effect of such a remark on them. Do you see any evidence for the idea that American Negroes will suddenly become pacifists when Russia becomes the enemy?

Or is your thought this, that no Negro can ever regard Russia as his enemy? Yes, some Negroes have embraced Communism in understandably violent reaction against what their people have suffered. But do you really think that the Negro people, who know the taste of suppression and slavery as well as any, can ever get sentimental about the repressive social system into which Russian Communism has degenerated today? Whatever good the Soviets have achieved, and it is not to be minimized, do you think that Russian slave labor camps, her rigid control of the masses, her suppression of ordinary civil liberties of those who do not follow the party line, suddenly cease to look like plain ordinary tyranny because they are under Soviet auspices?

Even with all the provocations to revolt that they have had in the discriminations, injustices, and inequalities they have suffered at our hands, our Negro people are led today by men and women who understand and accept the democratic structure of American life with its advantages and limitations, and intend to work within that framework to gain their great ends of equal opportunity and fair play. Not even a gilded Communist front group will long claim the support of a people who have long had to practise the art of knowing when they are being used—and when you said that no American Negro would fight against Russia, you were using them, and not kindly.

Now about these riots at Peekskill last year, when a mob of veterans and misguided patriots tried to prevent you from giving a concert. Along with other Americans who are sensitive to violations of ordinary democratic rights, I was horrified at these disgraceful attacks on you, and agree with the American Civil Liberties Union that they were "one of the most shocking outbursts of mob violence and violations of the right of assembly in years." And when the incredible Governor Dewey cheerfully placed the blame for the riots on you and your followers for organizing protective lines, I couldn't believe my eyes. This is what happened in Nazi Germany's early days, when the strong-arm hoodlums of Hitler instigated riots and then blamed the victims of the attack. These Peekskill riots are a horrible example of the futility and stupidity of trying to fight Communism by forcible suppression of Communist meetings. It is like trying to eliminate the Communist menace to our free institutions by eliminating the free institutions!

But didn't this violent flare-up remind you of anything? It did me! Do you remember only four or five years ago, when an odorous character named "Reverend" Gerald L. K. Smith was going around talking to mass meetings about Russians and Jews and other people he didn't like? He was preaching an American brand of Fascism that keeps popping up wherever a group of unbalanced, insecure, neurotic minds can be assembled in one place. Now, where did you stand on Smith's right to speak publicly? Judging from your wrath about the suppression of your own freedom at Peekskill, I would assume you would have been in the forefront of those who had the courage and insight, back in those days, to insist that even a rabble-rouser like Smith had to be heard if we were to maintain genuine civil liberties. Yes, you were in the forefront all right—but not on that side, Mr. Robeson. You were among those who sought to have the Smith meetings stopped, by force or injunction, to prevent him from speaking freely along lines you did not agree with. You and your friends called it "the fight against Fascism". Remember?

How peculiar is history's way of confronting us with principles that can be downright embarrassing, unless of course you don't give a hoot for principles. Civil liberties for those we detest—that was the liberal, American principle involved then, the same one that is involved in your singing at Peekskill or anywhere else. But now, by the irony of logical fate, you find yourself on the unpleasant receiving end of your own philosophy, your own lack of faith in democratic liberty even for the thought you dislike! Doesn't that logic ever bother you? Hasn't it penetrated to you and your left-wing friends, that either you have liberty for all, or you don't have liberty at all? Isn't your defense of liberty only for certain points of view a carbon copy in reverse of the "capitalist, bourgeois tyranny" you so thunderingly oppose?

This seems painfully obvious to me, but I suppose one has to be a liberal, to have some acquaintance with the workings of the free human spirit, and the really free play of ideas, to get that way. I know it takes a certain kind of courage to be a Communist or a near-Communist in America today, but I believe it takes courage plus intelligence to be a clear thinker and a defender of civil liberties not only for the ideas you favor but even for ideas you can't stand. As a liberal

who seriously believes in unfettered democracy with all its risks, I assure you that I and many people like me want to see you free to sing and speak without restraint, and we deeply resent these idiotic attacks on you and others who voice a viewpoint that is unpopular. We believe that democracy is healthy and virile enough to withstand even open criticism from anti-democratic forces in our country, whether they be Communist or Fascist. But my point is that you and your fellow-leftists do cut a rather ridiculous figure in bellowing indignantly about the denial of your liberties when everybody who can read knows what would happen to liberties generally if your point of view came into power in America. So in the name of honesty, let's ease up on this martyr pose. It's not fooling very many people.

But the really fundamental reason why liberals are concerned about you and your role in public life today is this: you are one of several outstanding men who in recent years have seen fit to move from your former liberal position to an out-and-out left-wing position. This of course is your privilege, and should be, if you feel that the logic of world events calls upon liberals to become left-wingers. But what makes your action of special concern to the great body of historic liberal thinking in America is that you and your friends seem to identify liberalism with leftism, as if they were one and the same thing—and this is exactly what conservative and reactionary minds do. "Liberals are practically Communists" cry the frightened ones, and lump all progressive and unorthodox opinion together, with the extreme dogmatism of Communism. And though you don't say it in so many words, you imply the same thing by your actions and attitudes. Your remarkable loyalty to the Communist party line in American public affairs, your zealous support of front organizations, and your uncritical and unquestioning attitude toward one particular nation not your own—all these suggest that your mind is made up on the point that a man has to be in or near the Communist camp to be a true liberal today.

It is exactly here, Mr. Robeson, that you have completely lost touch with reality, I'm afraid. Not only do you make it especially difficult for liberals, whose name and language you still use but whose methods and philosophy you seriously twist; but you commit mayhem on the plain meaning of words. The liberal spirit as I see it is supremely concerned with the continuous quest for the truth about human life and its problems, a quest that must be as impartial as possible, questioning and testing all things, even the most sacred and settled ones. That spirit has no undue respect for dogmatic, closed systems of thought that regard the Truth as already revealed, whether by the Bible, the Pope, or Karl Marx. In its loyalty to the spirit of free inquiry and free expression even for the thought we hate, the liberal spirit finds itself incurably suspicious of pompous absolutisms, like the dogma of free enterprise on the one hand and the dogma of collectivism on the other. Each of them spends most of its time and energy, not in seeking the truth it doesn't yet possess, but defending its own "revealed religion" against the dogmatism of the other, and devotes very little attention to discovering a practical, workable, flexible way of life for the world as it is. Each is utterly intolerant and fearful of views different from its own—the typical insecurity of the orthodox.

Meanwhile it is liberalism's historic function to keep the doors of thinking open and the traffic of ideas flowing freely. But what do you do? By your dramatizing of yourself as a martyred reformer at the stake, as a suppressed artist, as a hero of the "little" people, and a representative of the Negro people, which you no longer are, you make an emotional appeal to that in the liberal heart which hates oppression and admires social courage—you entice many earnest but confused liberals into supporting your cause, only to discover, as liberals always inevitably discover if they are gullible enough to "play footsie" with Communists and their fronts, that they have been taken in, used for a time, and then cynically attacked as middle-class vacillators, when their liberal principles of concern for objective truth and democratic civil liberties get in the way of the party line.

Can it be the Party's technique to destroy liberalism by sucking it in and getting the red label pasted on it, so that liberalism loses any effectiveness it may have had on the public? Is this because Communists, like any other kinds of totalitarians, despise nothing more than they despise the free spirit of open inquiry and democratic expression? Is this because any totalitarian philosophy must first shackle the free mind before it can hope to defeat another totalitarian competitor? Is it because the real threat to any totalitarian, whether of the right or of the left, is reasonable, progressive thinking that relies on democratic change, on the open, inquiring mind, and on completely free exchange of ideas to guide mankind to a solution of its problems?

These are some of the thoughts that run through the minds of many when they hear of your recent utterances, people who once regarded you as a good and noble friend of the free spirit, but who have seen you harden and become mechanical, until you have come to represent, not the Negro people or the liberal heart of democratic America that seeks gradual change toward greater freedom and justice, but only the extreme, dogmatic left wing which, like the reactionary right wing, will tolerate no criticism by questioners, no opposition by differing ideas, and no competition by free, democratic minds.

I don't know if this makes sense to you any more, Mr. Robeson, but I hope at least that it will touch a familiar chord in your memory, of a time when you, too, were a learner, a searcher who did not possess all the answers.

Yours for a united world free of the violence of tyranny and of the stuffiness of the closed mind.

PETER H. SAMSOM.

As a Christmas Gift

Send UNITY to a new reader

1 Year for $1.50

A Journal of Free and Critical Opinion

UNITY
700 Oakwood Blvd.
Chicago 15, Illinois

For the enclosed $1.50 send UNITY as a Christmas gift for one year to:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State.....

How a Day Nursery Can Spread Health

ETHEL S. BEER

In this disturbed world of ours, health looms large as a means of recovery. Sound bodies and sane minds are essential to make an enduring peace and to build a better world in the future. Public health, aware of its obligations, is expanding. Hospitals are enlarging their scope and entering more and more into the field of preventive medicine. Boards of Health are increasing their services. Health insurance is broadening its sphere and reaching a greater number of people. But despite this growth of public and private agencies, there still are wide gaps throughout the country.

Rich as New York is, it has its health problem. To meet it, hospitals are adding to their buildings and their facilities. Municipal health organizations are to be included in some of the new housing projects. In the course of time there may be adequate provision. However, until such provision is available, it seems ill-advised to close any existing health service. This applies particularly to Cannon St. Health Centre of Brightside Day Nursery, situated on Manhattan's Lower East Side, which was closed because of lack of financial support. The nearest hospital and health station are approximately a twenty-minute walk—a long distance to go with babies and small children. Moreover, Cannon St. Health Centre has been a unique undertaking setting Brightside apart from other day nurseries. This combination of a Health Centre and a Day Nursery made for an original project, which pioneered both in the public health and day care fields. As such it played a distinct role, and could and should have continued to do so.

Primarily, Cannon St. Health Centre aimed to serve Brightside Day Nursery children who received intensive health care—medical, dental, eye, and psychological. In a lesser degree, it endeavored to help others in the community, many of whom had a connection with Brightside Day Nursery. For these cases, there were medical check-ups. Some children, up to eleven years, also had dental treatment. A few were referred from the medical clinic for eye and psychological examinations. However, the dental, eye, and psychological clinics were reserved mainly for the Brightside Day Nursery children. The medical work, which expanded to the neighborhood, also concentrated principally on Brightside Day Nursery children. But the emphasis was broadened here to comprise the family and also former Day Nursery children. In a word, the program of Cannon St. Health Centre was, on the whole, concerned with the Brightside Day Nursery child of the past, present, and future.

To be a little more specific: Each Brightside family was regarded as a unit. Therefore, brothers and sisters, as well as the mothers, were accepted by Cannon St. Health Centre. The fathers were not eligible because a clinic for them proved too complicated to organize, although it was often contemplated. Children that left the Day Nursery, either temporarily or permanently, were still asked to come to the Health Centre, as were also members of their families. Thus, pre-school children that were irregular in their attendance at the Day Nursery were checked up at the Health Centre between times. Older boys and girls, who had outgrown the Day Nursery, also returned to the Health Centre. Many continued year after year. The same families, too, reappeared again and again, as new children were born. Often these were brought to the Health Centre as babies and when old enough entered the Day Nursery. Some of these, belonging to the well-baby clinic, had sisters and brothers or other relatives who were or had been in the Day Nursery. It might be that the tie reached back to a previous generation and even before the Health Centre existed. Former Day Nursery boys and girls often brought their children to the Health Centre from infancy. There was a strong attachment to Brightside Day Nursery, which the Health Centre accentuated. A mother, who in the past went to the Day Nursery, expressed this feeling in much these words:

"I bring my children here because I feel so at home. It's different from going to a regular clinic."

Cannon St. Health Centre was opened in March, 1923. Before this date, there was a Health Club for Brightside Day Nursery children of school age and their friends. This was run in an amateurish fashion by a volunteer leader. One year a girl developed scabies, which lasted eight months and spread to other children. During this time, the Health Club was closed, but the need for a doctor was made most evident. As a result a physician was engaged and clinics were established for the Health Club children. At the first session, only six children were brave enough to remain for the medical examination. The rest fled, being convinced, in spite of reassurance to the contrary, that they were "to get needles," because of a recent innoculation in school. The next week, they returned, having heard that no "needles" were given, and by the end of June the membership of Brightside Health Club had more than doubled. Thus Cannon St. Health Centre started.

In the beginning the physical set-up of the Health Centre was most inadequate. A room on the ground floor was assigned, with little daylight and poor artificial illumination. The furniture consisted of scales and a kitchen table, used as a combined doctor's desk and examining table. There was no waiting room. The children had to stay in the yard, in an empty classroom, or in the basement, until it was their turn to see the doctor. The first improvement occurred in the spring of 1924, when the quarters were moved up a flight and properly equipped with white hospital furniture, a basin with running water, and better lighting. Afterwards, there were a number of additions to the furniture and changes in layout. A corner of the room was partitioned off for an isolation room for sick Brightside Day Nursery children. Shortly after a dental unit was installed, thus combining a medical and dental clinic. Then the adjoining room was converted into a waiting room and furnished with posture chairs and tables, suitable for children and adults. Some time later, provision was made for a psychologist in this waiting room. When not in use by the Health Centre, it was used for naps for the older Brightside Day Nursery children.

In the Spring of 1924 a registered nurse joined the staff. When the work increased, she was given a part-time clerical assistant. Then in the summer of 1927 a social worker was engaged to replace this clerical

worker. This arrangement lasted until the fall of 1941, when it was decided to try out two registered nurses instead of a nurse and a social worker. With such a solution, it was possible to have a nurse on duty the hours that the Day Nursery was open, besides taking care of the ever-growing work of the Health Centre. As one of the later nurses was trained in public health, the program took on a more decided educational aspect.

The development of Cannon St. Health Centre occurred step by step. Only gradually was the health work at Brightside unified under Cannon St. Health Centre. About January, 1925, the health program for Brightside Day Nursery's pre-school children was taken over by the Health Centre's doctor. Before this a neighborhood doctor examined these children in their own classrooms, not in the clinic, as they did not belong to the Health Centre. Once this group was added to the Health Centre members, all the children attending Brightside Day Nursery proper were under the same doctor. Next the children coming to Brightside for other activities were urged to join the Health Centre. At that time there were sewing classes, a Girl Scout Troop, and a library under Brightside's roof. These brought boys and girls to Cannon St. Health Centre; many of whom continued to come after these activities ceased. The physical examinations for the Summer Home were also done by the Cannon St. Health Centre doctor until it was closed in the early 1930s.

As the need arose different services were offered. Because the adolescent girls were too shy to come to a man physician, a woman physician was engaged for them in 1925. Later, the Day Nursery mothers and also the staff members were looked after by her. The well-baby clinic began in the early years of the Health Centre's existence, as a result of Day Nursery mothers wanting to bring their new babies. After the closing of the Rivington St. Health Centre—a Board of Health station a block away—the number of babies from the general neighborhood increased. These could not be refused, whether or not they had a connection with Brightside Nursery families, since there was no other place nearby to go.

In 1928 the dental clinic was established in Cannon St. Health Centre. Previously the children had been going to Gouveneur Hospital dental clinic. This was inconvenient because of the distance, the time that the child had to wait, and the fact that pre-school children had to leave the Day Nursery building.

In the 1930s routine eye testing was started for Brightside Day Nursery children. Arrangements were also made for the same doctor to see the children in the hospital clinic, where they were sent for refractions and treatment, which could not be done in Cannon St. Health Centre.

About the fall of 1939 the psychological work began. Prior to this a psychiatrist on a volunteer basis had been used for a short while. But there were not enough serious cases amongst the Day Nursery children for her to continue. However, as some assistance with the Day Nursery children was essential, a psychologist with clinical experience was engaged.

These different clinics were added because of the aim—to serve the whole child. This aim was kept constantly in mind. The child was the primary interest, particularly the Day Nursery child. The original doctor, now called the Physician-in-Charge, integrated the Health Centre's program. It was the rule that every child must have a medical examination and continue to do so routinely in order to attend the other clinics. The Day Nursery children went to all the clinics, as a matter of course. However, the Health Centre never expanded sufficiently to allow all its members to pass routinely through the dental, eye, and psychological clinics. Children and adults that could not be followed up in the Health Centre had to be referred elsewhere. Ideally, the dental, eye, and psychological clinics should have been open as needed to all the Health Centre members, especially the children. Because of financial and other reasons this never occurred.

The Day Nursery children offered a rare opportunity. Their health care was intensive. The various clinics were developed principally for them. Besides, the health program was closely correlated with the educational and social service. The Physician-in-Charge acted as doctor for the Day Nursery and advised on all health and sanitary matters. The psychologist served as Educational Consultant. The Director of the Day Nursery was the final coordinator. Thus the Day Nursery child was served far more completely than would have been possible in an ordinary Health Centre. There was the foundation of a vital child research centre at Brightside, which only partially materialized.

During the years the value of Brightside's set-up was made apparent from four angles: that of the child, the family, the Day Nursery and the Health Centre—all important.

The child learned to come to the doctor without fear. This was particularly true of the Day Nursery children, who regarded a visit to the clinic as a treat. Often Tommy or Mary was seen searching for a scratch as an excuse to call on the doctor and the nurse. When the clinic worker went to the classrooms to collect the children that had to be examined, there was a regular chorus.

"Don't you want me?" was vociferously yelled by every child. The faces of those left behind showed keen disappointment.

In the clinic each child demanded attention. Even the tiniest blemish was exhibited for treatment. An application of "red medicine," as they called it, or a band-aid gave these small boys and girls great satisfaction. Invariably, too, they begged the doctor for a tongue depressor, known to them as "a stick" which they carried away proudly—a symbol of health service.

Neighborhood children from about six years up came to the Health Centre unaccompanied by an older person, either on their own initiative or in answer to a postal. Often a mother sent a message along and afterwards stopped in for a report from the doctor or the nurse. To have these children come alone was particularly remarkable in regard to the dental work because they knew that there might be pain in store for them. The staff knew how to win all the children. Take small Stanley: Terrified he came to the dental clinic, only because his mother insisted. She had tried a local dentist in vain. The first few times Stanley vomited and resisted so hard that little could be done to his teeth. Gradually he became more acquiescent. Before

the work was finished, he practically danced into the dental chair and was a star patient. The climax occurred one day. Stanley appeared all alone and unhesitatingly announced:

"I've come for the dentist."

Unfortunately he had to be refused because the dental clinic was closed to all but Day Nursery children. It has never been possible to cover all the children, even up to eleven years, for the reason that the dental clinic was primarily for the Day Nursery children. This was especially unfortunate as there has always been a decided dearth of dental facilities in New York City.

Though ordinarily the children of the neighborhood received only medical care, they were started on the path of positive health. With many the custom of periodic physical examinations became established. Due to the request of these boys and girls themselves, they were accepted through adolescence and even after they were adults, if they were already Health Centre members. With this group the health habit is now so firmly entrenched that they will continue to be checked up routinely for life, provided they can find the resources. Many will not be able to afford a private doctor, who will give the quality of service and the intensive training that they have received at Cannon St. Health Centre. The personal touch cannot be discounted.

"It's like coming to a friend, not a doctor," is the way one young woman, who had faithfully attended the Health Centre since childhood, expressed it.

For the family, the advantages of Brightside's set-up were briefly as follows: the inclusion of all the children in the health program was particularly helpful for the busy mothers, who did not have much time to attend to such matters. This applied especially to the working mothers whose children were in the majority in the Day Nursery. Besides, as these mothers continued to be employed after the children had outgrown the Day Nursery, the continued health care was exceedingly valuable. The accessibility of the Health Centre to the homes meant that from an early age the boys and girls could go back and forth unescorted. Moreover, the tired working mother was more likely to come for her own physical examination than if she had to go a distance. Too often she neglected such health supervision, considering herself last. However, a sick mother reacts on the child and in turn upsets the family. The thoroughness of the health care for Brightside Day Nursery children meant a great deal to these families. In fact, some have been known to choose this Day Nursery for this reason, and even to move back into the neighborhood to bring their children there.

Brightside Day Nursery profited from having Cannon St. Health Centre under the same auspices, because this intensified and broadened its scope. Its emphasis on health for the whole family was education of a vital kind. Both parents and children learned that they should not wait for illness to go to the doctor, but check up at regular intervals. Bringing the doctor to the child, as was done at Brightside, saved endless toting from clinic to clinic, so trying on the nerves of small children. Besides, Cannon St. Health Centre was pioneering in pre-school health work for Brightside Day Nursery children. Hence, such services could not always be found elsewhere. Lastly, reaching into the neighborhood, as Cannon St. Health Centre did, was a practical extension of interest in the families and the community. Therefore it created good will for Brightside Day Nursery.

For Cannon St. Health Centre, the value of its association with Brightside Day Nursery has already been made apparent. At the risk of repetition, this can be summarized as follows: The intimate atmosphere of the Health Centre was partially due to the long and close contact with Brightside Day Nursery families of the present and the past. In the Day Nursery the doctors could watch the routine behavior of children in a day by day environment. This gave them a different slant on children than they could acquire in private practice. Besides, they had a chance to make the long day as normal as possible. Because the mothers worked, these children sometimes had to be in groups for ten and even eleven hours. Obviously this was far from an ideal situation. Therefore, the advice of the experts of Cannon St. Health Centre was most beneficial.

The keynote of Cannon St. Health Centre was prevention. Such an emphasis is absolutely in keeping with the needs of Day Nursery children. During the War it was said that juvenile delinquency increased because so many mothers were employed. In a framework such as Brightside had, due to Cannon St. Health Centre, the harm can be counteracted to some extent. Although the design was developed specifically for Brightside Day Nursery children, it could be adapted to any similar group. The drawback is the extra expense, imposed on the already high cost of an ordinary Day Nursery. The only reply is that in the end prevention is cheaper than cure. Cannon St. Health Centre upheld this principle by giving such concentrated attention to Brightside Day Nursery children and following them up afterwards. This was the major part of its program.

To conclude: in Brightside's set-up, the objective of a Day Nursery—to care for the children of working mothers—has not changed. The inclusion of a Health Centre as part of this Day Nursery has enriched its program and increased its influence in the neighborhood. This combination has shown the hidden potentiality of a Day Nursery as an outstanding force in society. The recognition of this potentiality made it possible to attract and keep at Brightside doctors of competence and experience, who had initiative and vision. The fact that there was a Physician-in-Charge of the Health Centre gave professional leadership to its staff, and consequently more prestige. Inspiration was not lacking either. In turn, this stimulated the personnel of the Day Nursery, making their jobs more interesting. Obviously this reacted on the children, as the standard of their care was raised. In the Day Nursery field Brightside was a model because of its fine health work. To safeguard health in a community is a vital contribution that cannot be minimized. Such an aim should not be left out by any agency seeking to promote progress in this world. A Day Nursery can and should spread health effectively, both by practice and interpretation, even though this is not its main purpose.

The Method of Liberalism

J. RAY SHUTE

At best, definitions are temporary and have meaning only in terms of contemporary comparison. Therefore, to even attempt a definition of liberalism—a much abused term in these days—involves, necessarily, comparative terminology. It might be said, originally, that liberalism is not a group of "facts" which when one acquires them makes one a liberal. Rather, it would seem that liberalism is a method of acquiring knowledge. It is a method which is applied to all areas of life and not to one particular field of study. Liberals maintain that the method of science is the best and most trustworthy technique for evaluating data. A thing is not true because someone says that it is true, but it is true only when adequate proof is presented to substantiate it. Customarily, mankind accepts this method of securing information about everything—everything except religion!

During the youthful centuries of our race, man proceeded from day to day in his living in a vastly different manner from our own present-day living. As he went along he had to establish his own values and to conduct his own experiments, usually on a trial and error method. This, at first, was what we could call a "hit or miss" technique. He learned, for example, that certain herbs or berries were poison, only after some member of his family or tribe became ill or died as a result of eating them. He discovered that fire burns, as a result of contact with it. And so on down the list. Primitive man evolved from lower forms of animal life, as our anthropologists have discovered, and was not created by divine fiat. The world in which our ancestors anciently lived, as is true today, was neither favorable nor unfavorable to life. It was, and is, neutral.

Religion originally was, and unfortunately in some quarters still is, nothing more nor less than superstition; and fear was, and quite often still is, at the root of all ideas about the unknown. This unknown has ever been defined as God. Primitive man made many gods and formulated many rituals for their appeasement, a methodology still in use in many contemporary areas of human experience. The problems of early man became very greatly exaggerated with the appearance of authority.

As primitive society developed and became more complex, individuals took on varying importance in proportion to their own individual development. The greatest warrior in the tribe became chief. The one who proved most successful in the rites of appeasing the unknown became the witch doctor or medicine man, who also administered the healing magic of fetish, herb, and surgery. As time passed, the chief died, but usually not before he had imparted knowledge of war and leadership to a son, if he had one. The witch doctor guarded his rites and formulae, too, and handed his "secrets" down to another. So, the idea of some men having super knowledge and power developed and, thus, an elite class was created, giving rise to authority.

With the passage of the centuries, we note the increase in the authority of the ruling class and the priestly class, and so long as the human herd remained superstitious, they had those in authority to speak and act for them. In this manner man developed the idea of responsiveness to authority. It has proved to be a heavy yoke that man has borne. Unfortunately, authority has usually been wielded in the interest of the elite and not for the masses. Consequently, we soon begin to note the priestly class speaking for the unknown and interpreting the "voice" for the masses and even, in fact, for the rulers. When questions were asked, the authority quoted was the unknown, as if in very truth the unknown had given utterance. In time, as writing developed, the unknown voice was recorded for posterity and the canon of scripture developed. Through it all, however, it was man who was speaking for God.

In indicating the rise of religious authoritarianism, it has been intended to show that man, alone, has interpreted the unknown throughout the ages and as these concepts have been reduced to writing and, in turn, these writings have been collected and edited into a Bible, credulous mortals quote these human expressions and say: "It is the word of God." It is nothing of the sort; it is the word of man, no less. An early Christian preacher, by the name of Paul, wrote his letters, or epistles, to the congregations at Rome, or Corinth, or elsewhere and we now quote those documents as the word of God. In so doing, we are guilty of doing Paul a disservice, inasmuch as they were his words, not God's.

The rise of prophecy developed a new technique, called "revelation," and gave still additional authority to the spokesman of the unknown. It is a methodology which leads many honest scholars to place theology and astrology in the same category. The prophets, however, have been given an important place in religious history and writings. The early development of an eschatology of doom seemed to find many followers and they, even as those today, apparently were willing to lay aside their judgment and welcome such a deception. Not only is such procedure illogical and unscientific, it is intellectually dishonest.

Assuming, which we do not, that there were revelations of the unknown to human beings, why did this cease those many centuries ago? Has man become less intelligent as the generations flowed by, or are all of our inventions, discoveries, and developments figments of the imagination and not evidences of our progress? To the liberal it is not even conceivable that man would attain knowledge throughout the ages in every area of human experience, except religion. It simply does not make sense. Far too many people have assumed that man had no moral right to progress religiously; to them there are absolute "facts," which are unchangeable and fixed and cannot be improved upon. Such an attitude is not only unscientific, it is fatalistic and atavistic, and constitutes a lag on man's progress upward and onward through the ages.

The idea of making the unknown into a "super" natural world, replete with counterparts for everything in this natural world, was a hoax of the greatest magnitude. Aside from being unreasonable, it is impossible of rationalization and of no service whatever. Is life so repugnant that honest men must be forced to living meaningful lives through the promise of reward or in the fear of punishment? Surely there is more to life than such a depraved idea of being paid for living it.

Liberalism holds that there can be no religion higher than truth and that there are no ways by which we can attain knowledge other than those criteria developed by man. If there is magic in our world, then it is man-made and not an "outside" manifestation. Our magic

is best illustrated by such discoveries and inventions as electricity, radio, sulfa drugs, atomic energy, jet propulsion, and supersonics. We have long since discontinued looking for the philosophers' stone, the fountain of youth, an elixir of life, or an Aladdin's lamp. We can find no royal road to life, hence we reject, also, the idea of revelation as belonging to the same body of wishful thinking. Perhaps life is mysterious but it is not mystical. The only laws of which we have knowledge are natural laws and we find no evidence whatever of any other kind. The universe was not created, nor will it be destroyed; it changes constantly and doubtless always will, since it is composed of matter in motion. We no longer conceive of absolute time or absolute space; science teaches us that the only absolute acceptable is the velocity of light, hence time and space exist relatively. We have also discovered that truth, too, is relative and not an absolute. So, we live experimentally and seek no ultimate goals or absolutes; this idea differentiates liberals from fundamentalists. We seek our heaven in life, experience our hell here too.

The liberal's philosophy of life contains no place for a savior, since there is nothing lost that stands in need of being saved. Man, working out his salvation by character—that is, by deeds and not by creeds—attains his fullest measure of happiness and satisfaction in the here and now. The childish, although vicious, theory of original sin and all that this defeatism implies has no place in adult religion and belongs to the superstitious era when man was young, in constant fear and without the security that enlightenment brings. Since we know that we are free men in a free world, we do not propose to enslave either our minds or our bodies to some man-made institution which does little other than to inflate the ego of the elite who control these organizations. We realize that authoritarianism is evil, whether it operates on the left or right of center and whether the authority is vested in the group, in an individual, in a book, or in words spoken or implied. It is when man surrenders his freedom that he loses both his character and his self-respect; he becomes a slave.

If democracy is good for mankind in the state, then it is, likewise, good for him in his religion. It is inconsistent to surrender one's freedom in either area and attempt to retain it in the other. Such efforts are futile and result only in slavery, either mental or physical, and at this late hour man needs to learn this fundamental lesson of life. Most of us resent having someone insist that he has special knowledge which is denied to all of us. We, likewise, resent having our fellows, ofttimes with inferior education, try to force their opinions on us and even call us names when we refuse to discard our own tested opinions to blindly follow them. It is an insult to free men. No human has any favored position as regards knowledge; he works for and earns whatever insights he has. They are not conferred by magical means from outside of human ken. He who would tell you differently is either dishonest or deluded.

Liberals have arrived at an adult point of view and refuse to return to the nursery, even if the toys offered are brightly colored. Now that we have become men, we have put away these childish things. We also speak as men and not as children. We also act like men and not like children. We rely upon the authority of evidence and not upon myths and superstitions, even when they are oft-repeated. Age and repetition do not lend authority to mythology any more than threats of damnation from the mouths of other humans incite us to fear. There are old tricks of the trade, outworn these many centuries past. We do not frighten adults with tales of the nursery. Our greatest fear is of misguided mortals, egocentric and power-mad. They are humanity's devil incarnate. The man who threatens us for non-conformity is merely waving a red flag. He is wearing a badge of authority that is tin. He is a keystone cop and not the real thing at all. Our responsibility is at the bar of our own consciences and not in a kangaroo court set up by stooges play-acting as God.

There is no place in a free world for any but free men, and the truly liberal man will not cease in his efforts until every man is free. There is no place in a democratic world for an elite, who would force their opinions on others, either with or without their consent. Be it constantly remembered, leadership in a world of free men comes from the will of the majority and as a reward for a job well done. When this is not the case, then democracy is not properly functioning. There is no nobility in a democracy, a class that neither toils nor spins, but expects, vulturelike, to feed on the broken bodies of the masses. Nobility is of character and not of exclusiveness. No, freedom has no place for parasites who are unwilling to share equally in the blessings, as well as the responsibilities, of the liberal life. There is always this condition of liberty.

The method of liberalism, then, is the evaluation of life in terms of evidence and not in terms of exclusive revelation and magic. However, liberalism is more than a method of acquiring knowledge, it is also a way of life. Assuming correct attitudes toward life is important, but far more important is the implementation of those attitudes with action and service. To know is one thing, while to do is another. Liberals, for example, do not give too much attention to a particular God-idea, whether it be, for the moment, the God of the Jew, or the Christian, or the Mohammedan, or the Hindu. Rather, we give intense consideration to the whole panorama of gods, seeing in the broad sweep of the concepts of many cultures an idea, or group of ideas, having significance in terms of man's continual probing of the unknown and his efforts to properly equate himself in a revealing multiverse. Likewise, we strive to conceive of man, not as a particular individual at a particular time, but rather as a human procession of mankind through all of the ages and this lends importance to the idea that each of us is a part of eternal man, forever striving, progressing, learning, and developing. We form a moral commitment to the idea and this, then, binds us to every part of the whole, even as every drop of water relates itself to and is, in very truth, a part of the sea. Mankind must learn to adapt itself to the multiverse that contains it in manner similar to water, which adapts itself to the vessel that contains it. On this basis every individual becomes important and deserves our abiding love and cooperation; this position, obviously, was assumed by the Nazarene as he spoke so eloquently on the theme of brotherhood.

But, again, our concepts of brotherhood, noble though they be, are not enough. We must carry our theories into action and, as all great teachers have ever done, we, too, must proceed in the full knowledge of the price we might be called upon to pay. When the Carpenter's Son rode into Jerusalem on an ass nearly two thousand years ago, it was triumphant only in terms of the mastery of himself. He had not mastered the problems of his day, nor had he removed the

Roman yoke from his people; nor, indeed, had he been able successfully to meet the many social, ethical, political, economic, and religious problems of that time. But Palm Sunday becomes a great symbol to liberals, when we fully realize that Jesus was a fellow of our confraternity and he proceeded into the city, which was to reward him with Golgotha and the humble sepulchre, knowing too well the price that he had to pay for his infidelity, heresy, and non-conformity to contemporary culture. Like him, we should be willing to take our stand in our day; and with the same fearless spirit that animated him, we should meet the pressing and challenging problems of these hectic days in which we live. His example is magnificent and has deep meaning to us today. There is before us, too, a capital city to be entered, perhaps in the near future, and we must have courage to face denial, scorn, and even death, as did he, in order that the people may be told of the good news. It may also be that the yoke which lies so heavily upon our people may have the same geographical placement, even if in different terminology, as that which weighed upon his people. It is the age-old struggle against authority and in this battle we face it is more than passing strange that the similarity is so noticeable and involves, as of old, a Mediterranean cast and salutation—salutations that herald the rise and fall of Western culture: *Ave Ceasar* and *Ave Maria!*

The Power of Planning

HERBERT STURGES

I believe that from its beginning the World Federal Government could have a new power, the power of planning, not given, for example, to our American Federal Government.

I believe the power of planning can best be exercised by a unitary government consisting of representatives of the common interests, and of national interests. I do not want to see any division of World Federal Government into three separate parts. Our founding fathers divided our American Federal Government into legislative, executive, and judicial branches, making these branches not true branches at all, but separate from one another in a very un-branchlike manner. I have no objection to suitable branches of government that truly branch out from the main trunk, which I believe should be the representatives of common interests and of national interests. Such a government can have branches in the form of committees or commissions, each of which is suitably made up to handle the administration of certain kinds of World Federal Government operations, and to make clear the meaning and interpretation of plans adopted by the whole body of representatives.

The activity of world government could be along the lines of world planning, rather than world legislation. Laws are supposedly fixed and immutable until changed. Planning is essentially experimental and flexible. Law is arbitrary, and in the past has often been designed primarily for the satisfaction of influential special interests. In the future, governments can represent primarily the common human interests such as health, education, and general economic welfare. All future governments can be organized and conducted for the common interests. Any attempt to perpetuate the rule of special interests can be recognized as corrupt, brutal, and self-defeating. Only a common interest government can operate satisfactorily to all the people, which is the purpose and intention of government.

Each branch of the World Federal Government can therefore be a true branch, stemming from the main body of world government representing people's world common interests, and national interests. Each branch might consist primarily of professional specialists and technicians who have been chosen by world technical and professional organizations. For example, a World Health Organization could be built up, associating together all doctors of medicine, doctors of dentistry, pharmacists, technicians in biology, anatomy, physiology, surgery, medicine, physical therapy, psychiatry, neurology, other branches of health service, and public health administration. Such a World Health Organization could designate a group of its most skillful, competent, and well-informed members to form a part of the World Federal Government. Similarly a World Educational Organization could select some of its members to represent the peoples' world common interest of education in the World Federal Government.

The production, transportation, and distribution of food is a primary peoples' world common interest. Here several lines of work may combine and cooperate. Agricultural planning, planning for transportation and distribution may be in the hands of experts chosen by suitable world organizations of technicians and specialists in those fields of work. The combination of all groups needed for successful world agricultural planning would have the power to plan, to execute its plans, and to carry on all operations required for the satisfaction of the people's needs for agricultural products. Similarly for industry and manufacture.

Representatives of the nations in the different parts of the world would also be a necessary part of each world planning branch of the World Federal Government. In each kind of world planning the representatives of the nations can cooperate with the technicians and specialists in that field of work. Thus in the Health-Planning Branch of World Federal Government we need not only experts in the field of health, but also men and women who understand as fully as possible the health needs of each nation and each part of the world. This seems to require representation in the World Health-Planning Branch of the World Federal Government from the nations of the world, so as to assure the most appropriate allocation of health services and supplies to the different parts of the world. Similarly, the World Education-Planning Branch of the World Federal Government, whose duties include making world plans for education, and carrying out these plans, might have national representatives.

The membership of these branches of world government need not be fixed or exclusive. Each group can be free to secure the services of any and all available persons for advice and consultation. Sometimes Health and Education might meet together to plan for the health-education of the people of the world, and for the education of sufficient numbers of specialists in

the different fields of health service. The World Branches of Health and Agriculture may also need to work together. Cooperative plans for meeting the requirements of food, clothing, and shelter for the people of the different parts of the world can be skillfully made by the combined knowledge of specialists in many planning departments, including the department of World Health Planning.

I believe that one of the most important powers of planning which could be given to the World Federal Government is the power of planning the numbers of people in the different parts of the world. A World Population-Planning Branch of the World Federal Government could be established from the beginning of the world government. Many factors and conditions have caused the numbers of people in most parts of the world to become far too large. Natural biological forces have created for mankind the same population problems as for other forms of life. Biological evolution has grown out of a long process of natural selection for survival of the strongest individuals and the fittest species among all the excessive numbers of individuals reproduced, always far more than the environment can support.

As higher species develop, this over-procreation of numbers causes more and more suffering. The human race suffers terribly from the free operation of its powers of reproduction. But mankind has the power to limit its own fertility, and thus to prevent the human misery which results from over-population. In recent years these means have been increasingly employed by intelligent people. In some countries religion has been a barrier to the limitation of offspring. For reasons of defense other nations have condemned it. National ambitions seem to require large armies, which sets up the need for a high birth-rate. The increase of population intensifies the national desire for expansion. This was the vicious circle, for example, in Japan. In a world federation there seems to be no place for such destructive ideas and practices.

Only through the power of World Population Planning for the numbers of people in the different parts of the world, intelligently exercised by specialists in this work, and successfully carried out by education of the people of the world, can the World Federal Government's planning in other departments be made to succeed. The only way in which the services of health education, and economic security can be continuously effective in contributing to the welfare and happiness of the people of the world is through the adequate exercise of world population control. Each nation can learn to limit its numbers, each community, and each family. The procreative function of marriage can be kept down to the numbers desirable for the maintenance of local, regional, and national planned populations, as established by the research of the Population-Planning Branch of the World Federal Government.

Population planning is one of the major common interests of all people of the world. Without population planning none of the needs of mankind can be continuously satisfied. The people of any part of the world which fails to cooperate in planned population control will continue to suffer from privation and overwork, just as they have in the past. Only to the extent that each nation cooperates with World Population Planning can its people gain the benefits from world planning by the World Federal Government.

Here, then, is a small beginning of the outline of the organization of the peoples' common-interest-planning world government. All national governments may be constituted on this model. All national and local governments can be reorganized to serve the peoples' common interests by cooperating with the World Federal Government in planning to satisfy the peoples' needs for health, education, food, clothing, shelter, and all the good things of life.

The Study Table

Doubting Is Not Denial

SCIENCE, CONSCIENCE AND GOD. *By Geza Gaspar. New York: Helicon Press. 64 pp. $1.25.*

The story of man's belief in God and the denial of God runs parallel throughout the history of mankind. Man never renounced his ontological struggle, regardless of whether the outcome was affirmative or negative. Consequently, it is not surprising that the yearning for eternal knowledge and the doubt of ever possessing it is echoed in modern writings. Geza Gaspar, a New York journalist, interested in religion, philosophy, and science, has contributed to the interpretation of the problem in a study, entitled, *Science, Conscience and God.*

The author displays moral courage. The voice of the atheists, (atheistic existentialists) or of the agnostics (logical positivists) is more vociferous, especially in its intellectual intention, than the voice of the faithful, although Barth, Maritain, and other contemporary religious thinkers were able to awaken response in many readers. Gaspar represents the kind of a believer who acknowledges the validity of skepticism; one is reminded of Montaigne's dictum of "doubting his own doubts." The author stresses the relationship of the scientist to the known and unknown, declaring that "the thinking and understanding scientist will know that the conception of God is a necessary symbol in everyday life." He ends his study, stating that "when our scientists express their doubts, their negation is constructive." Evidently the implication is that doubting is not denial.

While some pronouncements are rather ambiguous and the writer is inclined to fall back on assumptions and devices without a judicious distribution between the probable and the obvious, and while the phrasing in many parts of the book seems inappropriate to the subject matter, nevertheless, the study reveals Geza Gaspar as a conscientious person, interested in fundamentals, endowed with catholicity of taste, and honesty of his convictions.

JOSEPH REMENYI.

Epitaph for Orthodoxy

THE REFORMATION OF THE CHURCHES. *By James H. Leuba. Boston: The Beacon Press. 219 pp. $2.75.*

This book concludes a lifetime of study of the psychology of religion. As James and Starbuck were the great names of the beginning of this field of study, James H. Leuba is the greatest American name of the developing science. He made use of such new techniques as questionnaires and statistics; he found new approaches. He was perhaps also sufficiently unscientific to condemn what he found detrimental or dangerous. *The Reformation of the Churches,* published posthumously, is a fitting and incisive conclusion to his lifework.

The book is also amazingly timely. It attacks directly the challenge of the alleged loss of faith and godlessness of this generation. If this is a time of mounting confusion and despair, should men answer the summons of the orthodox and reactionary to return to the old ways? Leuba answers, "No!" There is no refreshment in the old stagnant pools. The abandonment of orthodoxy for liberalism, science, and democracy in religion is not the failure of this age, but the triumph and the bright hope of restoration.

The most telling sections of the book deal with the psychological inadequacy of the old religion. Here Leuba is largely reviewing his earlier researches. He rehearses the evidence for his opinion that the psychology produced by the authoritarianism of the old churches, by that organization, and by the ancient creeds is destined to produce maladjustment rather than health. Far from being unable to live without the old faith, Leuba concludes that modern man is better off without it.

The book is properly titled, however, *The Reformation of the Churches* and not *The Abandonment of the Churches.* Leuba is well aware of the function of the church in communal life, and he is concerned that the churches recast themselves to make use of later day knowledge. The last section of the book outlines some directions of fruitful growth. Here he mentions with some approval the Ethical Societies, the Unitarians, and the Quakers; it is with the Ethical Society that he is most familiar. These pages are also a critique of these new movements, if one judges them against Leuba's vision.

These new movements have not understood personal psychology or the character of group life as they must, Leuba implies, and he states that they still cling too fondly to preaching when they must utilize new methods of individual therapy and group functioning. Leuba's sensitivity to the role of the individual is perhaps greater than his grasp of the dynamics of the group, yet here, too, he sees well beyond what any of us have yet been able to put into practice.

Leuba was too good a psychologist to be unaware of the value of the functions performed by the ancient churches and he knows well enough that the church of the future must meet the same needs; consequently, he discusses confession as he discusses religious ceremony. He goes so far as to include an Appendix with suggestions as to statements of belief (mostly well familiar to liberals), and meaningful services for Christenings, Marriages, and Funerals. It will interest some to note that he indicates that many such worthwhile experiments in a new liturgy have been conducted and that information may be obtained from *The Humanist.* Leuba expressly avoids identifying himself with Humanism; perhaps this is to emphasize that the "humanist-theist" issue is not under consideration. It is the old psychology which Leuba would banish, and all religious liberals will find here a good phrasing of the rebuttal to the charge that they have robbed man of his faith.

Religious liberals can be advised to put this book in the hands of the lukewarm, who see no harm in the antique religion even if they do not want it themselves.

THADDEUS B. CLARK.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page 62*)

attitude, however, is not that of appeasement to Russia. It lies in certain beliefs about Red China held by Nehru, along with many other able analysts in India.

Right or wrong, important Indian leaders believe that as far as Asia is concerned, in the long run Mao Tse-tung is destined to wield more influence than Stalin. They look beyond China's present relative weakness to a day when its population, almost a quarter of the entire world's, will have a vast economic and strategic potential.

But most of all, Indian leaders are convinced that if Communist China is admitted to the U.N., it will wield a very real influence of its own on Russia. The two governments might stand together outwardly, but behind the scenes Moscow might have to modify its programs.

As old revolutionists themselves, the Indians are cognizant of the shifts that have taken place inside the Indian Communist Party. In the past two years, during which Nehru has firmly put down Communist violence, Communism has undergone several splits over tactics. But the most significant of these stemmed from Moscow itself. Secretary General Ranadive, who had been excoriating those who tended to take Mao Tse-tung as a model, suddenly veered about and urged all Communists to follow Mao's example.

This meant widening out to take in more than the "proletarian peasantry." In the words of the Cominform instructions, Communism in India was to "unite all classes, parties, groups and organizations willing to defend the national independence. . ." In short, nationalism was stressed rather than internationalism; land reform was endorsed as against strict "revolution"; and Moscow officially backed what it has condemned elsewhere as "Titoism."

According to the Indian analysis, therefore, Moscow had to conform to Chinese conditions, and Mao pried the Kremlin away from some of its major dogmas. Carrying this analysis further, there is hope among the Indian leaders that by cooperation with Red China, they can exert some pressure, in the name of Asia, both to keep Mao Tse-tung from war and to prevent Moscow—and with it the Western capitalist democracies—from dominating the Asiatic continent.

This may turn out to be fallacious reasoning, but it figures considerably in Nehru's plea for admission of Communist China to the U.N.

—*Worldover Press.*

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

BOOKS WORTH HAVING

INFORMAL ADULT EDUCATION, by Malcolm S. Knowles, is a practical book in the field of Group Dynamics. It is an invaluable handbook for ministers, education directors, and leaders of discussion groups, forums, and other educational media. ($4.00)

THE ART OF BOARD MEMBERSHIP, by Roy Sorenson, is a clear and concise presentation of the nature and responsibilities of boards of voluntary agencies. It delineates the duties and prerogatives of the volunteers and the professionals. It should be in the hands of all ministers, board chairmen, and members of every church and social agency. ($2.00)

WHAT DO RELIGIOUS LIBERALS BELIEVE?, by Waldemar Argow, is the answer to many a Liberal's and Unitarian's need when he is frustrated by orthodox questions. Here is a readable and succinct presentation of what liberals believe about "Prayer," "the Bible," "Jesus," "God," "Immortality," and the "Church." A good book for those who are just finding their way out of orthodoxy. ($1.50)

UNITARIANISM TODAY, by Stephen H. Fritchman, is an excellent pamphlet to give to new members. It is a dynamic and convincing presentation of the present Unitarian position. (50c)

THE WIT AND WISDOM OF ROOSEVELT, edited by Maxwell Meyersohn, is the fourth in the "Wit and Wisdom" series. It is a source book for many pungent quotations. ($2.00)

All of these books are available through the Western Unitarian Conference Book Department.

NAMES WANTED

A new Unitarian Church is being organized on the South Shore of Long Island. If you have friends or acquaintances living in the following communities who might be interested in such a liberal church, please send their names to Rev. Lon Ray Call, Unitarian Headquarters, Hotel Ten Park Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.

Baldwin
Bellmore
Freeport
Garden City
Hempstead
Levittown
Long Beach
Lynbrook
Malverne
Merrick
Mineola
Mitchell Field
Rockville Centre
Roosevelt
Valley Stream
Wantagh

CHURCHES

People's Liberal, Chicago, has employed Mr. Arthur Hoover as Executive Secretary and Rev. Hartley Ray as Stated Supply for the current church year.

Free Religious Fellowship, Chicago, has arranged to hold its services during the current church year at the Abraham Lincoln Centre.

Madison, Wisconsin, held its first service in the new Frank Lloyd Wright church building, Sunday, October 1.

Sioux City, Iowa, has purchased an electric organ.

Ann Arbor, Michigan, has had an anonymous gift of an electric organ.

Duluth and **Virginia, Minnesota,** will hold regular services beginning October 8, 1950, with Mr. Kenneth Smith as interim minister. Mr. Smith was graduated from Meadville in June, 1949, and has spent the past year studying in England as a Cruft Fellow.

Minneapolis, Minnesota, has sold its building on Harmon Place and now has its services and offices in the Y.W.C.A. Their new building is under construction.

Rockford, Illinois, is celebrating its eightieth anniversary during October.

St. John's Church, Cincinnati, has begun construction of the first unit of its new building.

Grosse Pointe, Michigan, will install Rev. William D. Hammond as its minister the latter part of October.

Flint, Michigan, sponsored a lecture by Dr. Preston Bradley, September 29. Rev. Leon Land, the minister, has been giving a series of sermons on his trip abroad this summer.

GENEVA ASSEMBLY

Three hundred and sixty-three Unitarians participated in the program at College Camp the week of August 20 to 27. The excellent program, enthusiastic spirit, and intense interest of the group made for a memorable week.

Already, plans are underway for next year. Members of the Board for the coming year are:

Philip Schug, Lincoln, Nebraska, Chairman
Oscar Quimby, Cincinnati, Ohio, Vice Chairman
Esther Heinrich, Chicago, Illinois, Secretary
Hadley Grimm, St. Louis, Missouri, Treasurer
Mrs. D. Gilman Taylor, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Mrs. Robert Lawson, Dayton, Ohio
Darryl Snyder, Indianapolis, Indiana
Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford, Illinois
Howard B. Hauze, Chicago, Illinois
Miss Nancy Jack, Kansas City, Missouri
Ernest W. Kuebler, Boston, Massachusetts
Randall S. Hilton, Chicago, Illinois

Retiring from the Board this year were Mrs. Kenneth Casson, Rockford; Mrs. Randall Hilton, Chicago; and Mr. Fritz Schaefer, Indianapolis. The constructive contributions which they made to the Geneva Institute are deeply appreciated. A special mention should be made of the eight years of exceptional service rendered by Fritz Schaefer as Treasurer. Their places were filled by Mrs. Taylor, Mr. Snyder, and Mr. Grimm.

Mrs. Fritz Schaefer, "Mary" as she is affectionately known to all Geneva-goers, is the only person who has a perfect record of attendance, 1937 to 1950. Congratulations and Orchids!

The following churches were represented:
Alton, Illinois
Chicago, Illinois: First
Free Religious Fellowship
Third
People's
People's Liberal
Evanston, Illinois
Geneva, Illinois
Hinsdale, Illinois
Rockford, Illinois
Urbana, Illinois
Fort Wayne, Indiana
Hobart, Indiana
Indianapolis, Indiana
Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Davenport, Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa
Louisville, Kentucky, First
Detroit, Michigan
Hanska, Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota
Kansas City, Missouri
St. Louis, Missouri
Lincoln, Nebraska
Omaha, Nebraska
Cincinnati, Ohio: First
St. John's
Dayton, Ohio
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Church of the Larger Fellowship
Whiting Congregational, Indiana
Mount Pleasant, Iowa, Universalist
Gary, Indiana, Chapel of the Dunes
West Newton, Massachusetts
Summit, New Jersey

MENDELSOHN, GENEVA DEAN

Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., of Rockford, was elected by the Board of the Lake Geneva Summer Assembly to be the Dean of the 1951 Institute. Mr. Mendelsohn served as program director of this year's session. Previously he had served as A.U.Y. director. Randall S. Hilton, who served as Dean for the Institute's meeting in the years 1944-50, will continue with the Institute as business manager. Mrs. Esther Heinrich was reëlected registrar.

UNITARIAN SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Greater Chicago Committee of the Unitarian Service Committee, Incorporated, is planning a financial campaign in the Chicago area between November 15 and December 15, 1950. The Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, Governor of Illinois, is the honorary chairman. Dr. Curtis W. Reese is the general chairman. Miss Ruth Coleman is the chairman of the executive committee. The list of sponsors includes all of the Unitarian ministers in the Chicago area, Marshall Field, Dr. George D. Stoddard, Clifton Utley, Quincy Wright, Dr. Rudolf Dreikurs, Dr. Ralph Gerard, and Dr. Dallas B. Phemister.

The committee also sponsored an institute for Service Committee leaders which was held at Meadville House on September 16. Representatives were present from nearly all the Chicago area churches, Minneapolis, St. Paul, St. Louis, and Rockford. Mrs. Dudley Moore, Director of Home Service Projects, told of the Work Camps held this summer and the plans of the Home Service Committee. Dr. Alonzo Grace, Miss Lea Taylor, and Dr. Maury Massler told of the educational and medical missions to Europe. Mr. Howard O'Dell, finance consultant of the Unitarian Service Committee, Incorporated, spoke of the problems of organization and money raising.

At the present time a city-wide financial drive for the Service Committee is being held in St. Louis. A committee representative of Unitarians and non-Unitarians is in charge.

It is the hope of the Unitarian Service Committee that other churches will follow the example set by the Minnesota Service Committee, the Greater Chicago Committee, and the St. Louis Committee.

UNITED UNITARIAN APPEAL

The Western Conference Regional Committee on the United Unitarian Appeal has been completed. The members of the Committee are:

Howard B. Hauze, Chicago—Chairman
Roman Hruska, Omaha, Nebraska
Mrs. D. Gilman Taylor, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Thaddeus B. Clark, St. Louis, Missouri
David Connolly, Rockford, Illinois
Robert Risk, Indianapolis, Indiana
Albert MacCleery, Birmingham, Michigan
Albert Hayes, Chicago, Illinois

The Committee met at College Camp during the Lake Geneva Conference. Requests have gone to the churches asking them to set their goals and appoint their Appeal chairmen. Various types of publicity and campaign materials are available, including wire recordings, slides, and brochures on the Appeal, General Alliance, A.U.Y., and the Western Conference. Orders for quantities of materials and the scheduling for the use of the recordings and slides should be made through the Conference Office.

The Creed of a Liberal

WE BELIEVE in man: in the autonomy of his spirit and the primacy of his claims over the claims of all forms of organizations.

WE BELIEVE in freedom: in the fullest possible freedom compatible with responsibility.

WE BELIEVE in authority: but only such as is sanctioned by reason and consent.

WE BELIEVE that the only tools of human progress are education, experience, cooperation.

WE BELIEVE that to be well-governed is not as desirable as to be self-governed, and that benefits bestowed are not as desirable as benefits achieved. Therefore, we reject every millenium proffered at the spearpoint of dictatorship.

WE BELIEVE that all truth is made manifest by the clash of ideas and that at the heart of progress there is the exchange of opinions and the privilege of nonconformity.

WE BELIEVE in tolerance, but not indifference; in enthusiasm, but not fanaticism; in convictions, but not obsessions; in individualism, but not isolation; in struggle, but not in hate.

—*Rabbi Silver.*